

MAY 04 2006 13:50 FR KING AND SPALDING 404 572 5134 TO 3443#21300#10500 P.04

Auto-Reply Facsimile Transmission

COPY



TO:

Fax Sender at 404 572 5145

Fax Information

Date Received:

9/26/2005 5:35:45 PM [Eastern Daylight Time]

Total Pages:

9 (including cover page)

ADVISORY: This is an automatically generated return receipt confirmation of the facsimile transmission received by the Office. Please check to make sure that the number of pages listed as received in Total Pages above matches what was intended to be sent. Applicants are advised to retain this receipt in the unlikely event that proof of this facsimile transmission is necessary. Applicants are also advised to use the certificate of facsimile transmission procedures set forth in 37 CFR 1.8(a) and (b), 37 CFR 1.6(f). Trademark Applicants, also see the Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure (TMPE) section 306 et seq.

Received
Cover
Page
=====>

SEP 26 2005 17:02 FR KING & SPALDING LLP 404 572 5134 TO 3443#21300#10500 P.01

KING & SPALDING, LLP

191 Peachtree Street
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-1743
Telephone: 404/572-4200
Facsimile: 404/572-5134
www.kspat.com

FAX TRANSMISSION SHEET

September 26, 2005

TO: Examiner Mark Vitz
CAU 3629
U.S. Serial No. 03,766,726

Company: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Fax #: 371-273-8300

City/State: Alexandria, VA 22313

Mail Stop Amendment

FROM: Kerry L. Brooks 3443

Our Ref. #: 21300.105003

NUMBER OF PAGES (including transmittal sheet): 9

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS FACSIMILE MESSAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION INTENDED FOR THE USE OF THE ADDRESSEE LISTED ABOVE. IF YOU ARE NOT THE ADDRESSEE, YOU ARE NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISCLOSURE, REPRODUCTION OR THE TAKING OF ANY ACTION IN RELIANCE ON THE CONTENTS OF THIS MESSAGE IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS TELETYPE IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY US BY TELEPHONE TO ARRANGE FOR RETURN OF THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS TO US.

If transmission problems occur or you are not the intended recipient, please call 404.572.3439 immediately. Thank you.

Notice of Contents

Documents Submitted Via Facsimile:

Applicant: Carolyn Platin

Serial No.: 03,766,726

Filed: January 22, 2001

For: Method and System for Providing Management Services in an On-Line Computing Environment

Papers Filed: Amendment Transmittal w/duplicate (2-pgs.); Written Restriction Requirement (6-pgs.)

PAGE 19 RCVD AT 09/26/05 5:35:45 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] SVR:USPTO-EFXXF-6/29 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:404 572 5134 * DURATION (mm:ss):04:50

PATENTS

IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Carolyn Pianin

Application No. 09/766,726

Filed: January 22, 2001

For: Method and System for Providing
Management Services in an On-Line
Computing Environment

Confirmation No.: 1308

Art Unit: 3629

Examiner: Naresh Vig

Attorney Docket No. 21300.105005

COPY

AMENDMENT TRANSMITTAL

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

September 26, 2005

Sir:

Transmitted herewith are papers in the above-identified application.

- ☒ Response to Written Restriction Requirement.
☐ Applicant(s) claim small entity status. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.27.
☒ An additional fee is not required.
☐ The additional fee is calculated as shown below:

	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT		HIGHEST PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA	SMALL ENTITY		LARGE ENTITY	
					RATE	ADDIT. FEE	RATE	ADDIT. FEE
TOTAL	20	MINUS	20=	0	x25	\$	x50	\$ 0
INDEP.	3	MINUS	3 =	0	x100	\$	x200	\$ 0
FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIMS					+180	\$	+360	\$
TOTAL					ADDITIONAL FEE		\$	
					\$		\$ 0	

- ☒ The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees required under 37 CFR § 1.16, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 11-0980. A duplicate of this sheet is enclosed.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, Attn: Examiner Naresh Vig, GAU 3629, Facsimile No. 571-273-8300 on September 26, 2005.

Kerry L. Broome
 Kerry L. Broome, Reg. No. 54,004

KING & SPALDING LLP
 45th Floor
 191 Peachtree Street, N.E.
 Atlanta, Georgia 30303
 Telephone: 404.572.4600

By: *Kerry L. Broome*
 Kerry L. Broome, Reg. No. 54,004

PATENTS

IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Carolyn Pianin

Application No. 09/766,726

Filed: January 22, 2001

For: Method and System for Providing
Management Services in an On-Line
Computing Environment

Confirmation No.: 1308

Art Unit: 3629

Examiner: Naresh Vig

Attorney Docket No. 21300.105005

COPY

AMENDMENT TRANSMITTAL

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

September 26, 2005

Sir:

Transmitted herewith are papers in the above-identified application.

DUPLICATE

- ☒ Response to Written Restriction Requirement.
☐ Applicant(s) claim small entity status. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.27.
☒ An additional fee is not required.
☐ The additional fee is calculated as shown below:

					SMALL ENTITY		LARGE ENTITY	
	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT		HIGHEST PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA	RATE	ADDIT. FEE	RATE	ADDIT. FEE
TOTAL	20	MINUS	20=	0	x25	\$	x50	\$ 0
INDEP.	3	MINUS	3 =	0	x100	\$	x200	\$ 0
FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIMS					+180	\$	+360	\$
TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE						\$	\$ 0	

- ☒ The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees required under 37 CFR § 1.16, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 11-0980. A duplicate of this sheet is enclosed.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, Attn: Examiner Naresh Vig, GAU 3629, Facsimile No. 571-273-8300 on September 26, 2005.

Kerry L. Broome
 Kerry L. Broome

KING & SPALDING LLP
 45th Floor
 191 Peachtree Street, N.E.
 Atlanta, Georgia 30303
 Telephone: 404.572.4600

By: *Kerry L. Broome*
 Kerry L. Broome

PATENTS

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)	
Carolyn Pianin)	Atty Docket: 21300.105005
)	
Application No.: 09/766,726)	Art Unit: 3629
)	
Filing Date: January 22, 2001)	Examiner: Naresh Vig
)	
Title: Method and System For)	Confirmation No.: 1308
Providing Property)	
Management Services In)	
An On-Line Computing)	
Environment)	

COPY

RESPONSE TO WRITTEN RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

September 26, 2005

Sir:

In response to the Restriction Requirement mailed on August 25, 2005, please consider the remarks presented herein. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the Restriction Requirement based on this response.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, Attention: Naresh Vig, GAU 3629, Facsimile No. 571-273-8300, on September 26, 2005.

Kerry L. Broome

Kerry L. Broome, Reg. No. 54,004

Application No. 09/766,726

REMARKS**Summary Of The Restriction Requirement**

Claims 1-4 and 11-26 were subject to a Restriction Requirement imposed by the Examiner on August 25, 2005. Claims 1, 12, and 20 are the independent claims.

In the Restriction Requirement, the Examiner grouped the claims as follows:

Groups	Relevant Claims
Group I	1-4 and 11
Group II	12-19
Group III	20-26

Request for Reconsideration of the Restriction Requirement

In the Restriction Requirement of August 25, 2005, the Examiner states that three distinct inventions are present in the application, that the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art, and that the search required for any one invention is not required for the other inventions. Based on that analysis, the Examiner concluded that the inventions are restrictable. Applicant traverses the Restriction Requirement asserted by the Examiner in the present application.

Applicant submits that the Examiner failed to establish two-way distinctness between the groups and reasons for insisting on the restriction, as set forth in more detail below

The Examiner's Burden to Support a Restriction Requirement of an Alleged Combination/Subcombination

To support a Restriction Requirement, the Examiner must show both (1) two-way distinctness and (2) reasons for insisting on restriction, i.e., separate classification, status, or field of search. See MPEP §§ 806.05(c) and 808.02. Applicant submits that the Restriction Requirement mailed August 25, 2005 is improper because the Examiner has not established either of the requirements for supporting a Restriction Requirement.

Application No. 09/766,726

The Examiner Failed to Establish Two-Way Distinctness of the Inventions Because the Examiner did not Show that a Subcombination has Utility Either by Itself or in Other and Different Relations

Inventions are distinct if it can be shown that a combination as claimed: (A) does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (B) the subcombination can be shown to have utility either by itself or in other and different relations. See MPEP § 806.05(c). The burden is on the Examiner to suggest an example of separate utility for each subcombination, which utility must be other than used in the combination. See MPEP § 806.05(c), Examiner Note No. 3 and subsequent paragraph. In the restriction requirement mailed August 25, 2005, the Examiner did not include suggestions of separate utility for any of the claimed combination-subcombination groups. Therefore, Applicant submits that the Examiner failed to meet one of the requirements of Section 806.05(c) to show that the three inventions are distinct. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the Restriction Requirement is improper and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner Failed to Establish Reasons for Insisting on Restriction, i.e., Separate Classification, Status, or Field of Search

Groups I and II and Groups I and III:

The Examiner provided insufficient reasons for insisting that restriction between the inventions defined by Groups I and II and Groups I and III is necessary. MPEP § 808.02 states that the Examiner must show one of the following to establish reasons for insisting upon restriction: (1) separate classification thereof; (2) a separate status in the art when they are classifiable together; or (3) a different field of search. First, separate classification has not been met, as the Examiner has classified the Groups I and II and Groups I and III in the same class, namely Class 705, subclass 26. Secondly, the Examiner has failed to establish a separate status in the art when the inventions are classifiable together. MPEP § 808.02 states that separate status in the art may be shown by citing patents which are evidence of such separate status. The Examiner has not cited any patents to give evidence of separate status; therefore, the Examiner has not established a separate status of the inventions. Additionally, the Examiner has not

COPY

Application No. 09/766,726

established that a separate field of search is required for the inventions defined by Groups I and II and Groups I and III. Applicant respectfully submits that a different field of search is not required for Groups I and II and Groups I and III. A different field of search is required where it is necessary to search for one of the distinct subjects in places where no pertinent art to the other subject exists. See MPEP § 808.02. Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that the same field of search will be required between Groups I and II and Groups I and III because claims from both groups relate to and identify commercial real estate service providers that provide commercial real estate services. Therefore, as stated in Section 808.02 of the MPEP, "Where, however, the classification is the same and the field of search is the same and there is no clear indication of separate future classification and field of search, no reasons exist for dividing among related inventions."

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to establish sufficient reasons for insisting on restriction between the inventions defined by Groups I and II and Groups I and III.

Groups II and III

The Examiner provided insufficient reasons for insisting that restriction between the inventions defined by Groups II and III is necessary. MPEP section 808.02 states that the Examiner must show one of the following to establish reasons for insisting upon restriction: (1) separate classification thereof; (2) a separate status in the art when they are classifiable together; or (3) a different field of search. First, separate classification has not been met, as the Examiner has classified Groups II and III in the same class, namely Class 705, subclass 26. Secondly, the Examiner has failed to establish a separate status in the art when the inventions are classifiable together. MPEP § 808.02 states that separate status in the art may be shown by citing patents which are evidence of such separate status. The Examiner has not cited any patents to give evidence of separate status; therefore, the Examiner has not established a separate status of the inventions. Additionally, the Examiner has not established that a separate field of search is required for the inventions defined by Groups II and III. Applicant respectfully submits that a different field of search is not required for Groups II and III. A different field of search is

COPY

Application No. 09/766,726

required where it is necessary to search for one of the distinct subjects in places where no pertinent art to the other subject exists. See MPEP § 808.02. Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that the same field of search will be required between Groups II and III because claims from both groups relate to "request criteria defining [a] real estate service" and "request criteria identifying a specific property and [a] real estate service." Specifically, in both Groups II and III the "request criteria" relate to "a request for information regarding a requested real estate service." Therefore, as stated in Section 808.02 of the MPEP, "Where, however, the classification is the same and the field of search is the same and there is no clear indication of separate future classification and field of search, no reasons exist for dividing among related inventions."

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed to establish sufficient reasons for insisting on restriction between the inventions defined by Groups II and III.

Applicant has addressed only the issues deemed most relevant at this point in rebutting the Restriction Requirement. Applicant's decision not to address any requirement for a Restriction Requirement is not an admission that such requirement is met by the Examiner Restriction Requirement mailed August 25, 2005. Applicant reserves the right to address additional issues in future correspondence.

ELECTION

In order to be responsive to the requirement, the Applicant hereby elects, WITH TRAVERSE, Group I (Claims 1-4 and 11) for prosecution on the merits in this application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his Restriction Requirement and act on all of the claims in the present application. If the Examiner does persist in his Restriction Requirement, Applicant reserves the right to file a petition and/or to file a divisional application directed to the Group II and Group III claims as proposed by the Applicant at a later date if they so desire.

COPY

Application No. 09/766,726

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action mailed August 25, 2005. Applicant has submitted remarks to traverse the Restriction Requirement. Examination of all the claims of record is hereby courteously solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any issues exist that can be resolved by telephone conference, or that any formalities exist that can be corrected by an Examiner's Amendment, please contact the undersigned at (404) 572-4647.

Respectfully submitted,

Kerry L. Broome

Kerry L. Broome
Reg. No. 54,004

KING & SPALDING LLP
191 Peachtree Street
45th Floor
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-1763
404.572.4600
K&S Docket No. 21300.105005

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

☒ **BLACK BORDERS**

☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**

☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**

☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**

☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**

☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**

☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**

☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**

☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**

☒ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.